

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 6-15 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, Applicant amends 6.

Claims 9-15 have been withdrawn from further consideration as being directed to non-elected species. Claims 9-15 are dependent upon generic Claim 6. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner rejoin and allow non-elected Claims 9-15 when generic Claim 6 is allowed.

Applicant greatly appreciates the courtesies extended by the Examiner in the Personal Interview of November 6, 2008. In the Personal Interview, Applicant's counsel explained the differences between the present invention and the applied prior art reference, Saitoh et al. (US 6,137,447). So as to more clearly distinguish Applicant's Claim 6 over Saitoh et al., the Examiner suggested amending Claims 6 to clarify that the control substrate is provided with a transmitting/receiving circuit, in addition to being provided with a coil. The Examiner also suggested amending Claim 6 to clarify that the loop antenna and the circuit are electromagnetically connected to each other as a result of magnetic coupling so as to distinguish the features recited in Claim 6 over a wired connection.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended Claims 6 to recite the features of "a control substrate provided with a coil and **with** a transmitting/receiving circuit," and "a magnetic coupling between the coil and the loop antenna causes the loop antenna and the transmitting/receiving circuit to be **electromagnetically** connected to each other" (emphasis added).

The Examiner objected to the application and alleged that Applicant is required to submit an amendment to the first sentence of the specification which provides reference to the prior application. Presumably, by "prior application," the Examiner is referring to PCT/JP2004/009180 of which the present application is a National Stage entry.

As noted by Applicant's counsel and acknowledged by the Examiner in the Personal Interview of November 6, 2008, this allegation is clearly incorrect because

there is no requirement to include reference to an International Application in the first sentence of the specification of a National Stage Application filed under 35 U.S.C. 371. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection.

Claims 6-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Saitoh et al. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of Claims 6-8.

Claim 6 as been amended to recite:

A reader/writer comprising:  
an antenna substrate provided with a loop antenna; and  
**a control substrate provided with a coil and with a transmitting/receiving circuit;** wherein  
**a magnetic coupling between the coil and the loop antenna causes the loop antenna and the transmitting/receiving circuit to be electromagnetically connected to each other.** (emphasis added)

With the unique combination and arrangement of features recited in Applicant's Claim 6, including the features of "a control substrate provided with a coil and with a transmitting/receiving circuit" and "a magnetic coupling between the coil and the loop antenna causes the loop antenna and the transmitting/receiving circuit to be electromagnetically connected to each other," Applicant has been able to provide a reader/writer that can be configured without using a communication cable to connect a transmitting/receiving circuit on a control substrate and a loop antenna (see, for example, paragraph [0007] of the Substitute Specification).

As discussed in the Personal Interview of November 6, 2008, Saitoh et al. fails to teach or suggest any transmitting/receiving circuit, and thus, Saitoh et al. certainly fails to teach or suggest the features of "a control substrate provided with a coil and with a transmitting/receiving circuit," and "a magnetic coupling between the coil and the loop antenna causes the loop antenna and the transmitting/receiving circuit to be electromagnetically connected to each other" as recited in Applicant's Claim 6.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Saitoh et al. fails to teach or

Application No. 10/565,697  
November 18, 2008  
Reply to the Office Action dated July 29, 2008  
Page 6 of 6

suggest the unique combination and arrangement of features recited in Applicant's Claim 6.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated over Saitoh et al.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 6 is allowable. Claims 7 and 8 depend upon Claim 6, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that Claim 6 is allowable. In addition, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner rejoin and all non-elected Claims 9-15 which are dependent upon generic Claim 6.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

To the extent necessary, Applicant petitions the Commissioner for a One-Month Extension of Time, extending to December 1, 2008 (November 29, 2008 falls on a Saturday), the period for response to the Office Action dated July 29, 2008.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 18, 2008

/Christopher A. Bennett, #46,710/  
Attorneys for Applicant

**KEATING & BENNETT, LLP**  
1800 Alexander Bell Dr., Suite 200  
Reston, VA 20191  
Telephone: (571) 313-7440  
Facsimile: (571) 313-7421

Joseph R. Keating  
Registration No. 37,368  
  
Christopher A. Bennett  
Registration No. 46,710